



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,700	02/19/2004	Stephan K. Barsun	200313280	5555
22879	7590	05/10/2005	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			PRASAD, CHANDRIKA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,700

Applicant(s)

BARSUN ET AL.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Serial numbers of copending applications are missing (see Page 7).

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement filed 2/19/04 have a lot of references but their relevance to the instant invention is questionable because no explanation of their relevance was provided.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-13, 15-17, 19, 20-25, 28-36 and 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sathe et al. (5754400).

Sathe (Figures 1-2) shows a computing system having a circuit board 202, a first connector portion 104a, 106a connected to the circuit board and a second connector portion (not numbered) connected to an electric device in an electronic component 106 (integrated circuit chip) coupled to a heat sink 102 and connected to the first connector

portion along an axis and a plurality of resilient support members (springs) 220 in compressed state asymmetrically located about the axis and extending between the device and the circuit board. The resilient support members are configured to engage the circuit board before engaging the second connector portion with the first connector portion. A power pod connection to the chip and placement of the power pod such that the support members extend between the pod and the circuit board are inherent. The components 106, 104 have a center of mass which is offset from the connection axis of 106 and 104, thus providing a torque and tilt which is compensated by the resilient spring members 220.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sathe et al. (5754400).

Sathe shows all the features of these claims except the first and second connector portion comprising a plurality of sockets and pins. An official notice is given that such a feature is common knowledge, well known and widely used in electrical connectors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the first and second connector portions as sockets and

Art Unit: 2839

pins because this require a mere use of a well known feature for making electrical connection involving only ordinary skill in the skill.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sathe et al. (5754400).

Sathe shows all the features of this claim except a second heat sink. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide a second heat sink because this would require a mere duplication of essential parts, which involve only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Co. vs. Bemis co., 193 USPQ 8.

9. Claims 9-10 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sathe et al. (5754400).

Sathe shows all the features of these claims except the placement of the power pod between the support member and second connector or the support members extending between the power pod and the circuit board or the placement of the component, the connector portions and the resilient support members. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide such a feature since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japiske, 86 USPQ 70.

10. Claims 14, 26 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sathe et al. (5754400).

Sathe shows all the features of these claims except a resilient foam member. An official notice is given that such a feature is common knowledge, well known and widely

Art Unit: 2839

used in electrical connectors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide such a feature because this requires a mere use of a well known feature for providing cushion.

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Audet et al. (6302702), Umezawa (6023413), Luebs et al. (6477058), Pearson et al. (6501658), and Dehaine et al. (5901039).


***Contact Information***

12. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (571) 272-2099.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is (703) 872-9306.



**Chandrika Prasad**  
Primary examiner  
April 29, 2005